

NOTES ON “SPACE BETWEEN” AS OF 8/11/13

“...the possibility of ideological and intellectual purity, against the communistic “decoys” of what has become standardized...” (Apologia, 19-20)

What constitutes “ideological and intellectual purity” in philosophical discourse? How might it be attained, theoretically and textually?

What is the language or dialect of purity, once purity has been defined? Is it tenable that such a dialect exists, and is comprehensive yet precise enough to avoid foundational confusions, ruptures, and breakages in meta-rational “linkage”?

What is any given philosophical discourse “purified” of? How many presences need to participate in a philosophical discourse for it to vindicate its own presence?

Can “purity” inhere in ideology, ever? Is ideology, “uttered and owned,” placed into a space textually and conceptually clean enough to call it “pure”?

Can ideology be “purified” by iteration of its essence?

“Textual purity” and “dialectical purity” as a dialectic-in-itself towards a “pure” synthesis, not “decoyed” by the socio-linguistic disguises of America and the representatively American: once these terms have been defined.

“...The Chain of Purification...”

Primordial Primary Mode: “History.” History as “extended presence”; History also posited against “Will” and the Body, threatening the efficacy of their presence; how and why does “history” act as a conduit for major high art consonance? The Will of the artist against History, yet desirous of its spoils; how does purity inhere in this interaction?

What forms of history dictate formal rigor and its representations over epochs? Is it cultures or subjectivities which dictate and occupy the most space?

More primordially: what exactly is, and constitutes, “history,” in aesthetics and elsewhere, and why does it take into its maw all the Primary Modes on the Purification Chain, thus necessitating the Secondary Modes and Space Between?

Why must the dialectical tensions on the Purification Chain have to do with hierarchy and hierarchical thinking (Primary and Secondary Modes); more importantly, does hierarchy

and its implicit classicism date this discourse beneath Deconstruction, Modernity, and post-modernity, even for a twenty-first century audience weaned against the classicist?

“...that the being of things subsists not out of our notions of them, nor our ideations of them; nor do things subsist as Kantian things-in-themselves or as independent entities; rather, they subsist of the balancing link between the thing-in-itself and our ideations of the thing-in-itself...” (Introductory Notes, 1-3)

How much of the meta-rational argument states its case cohesively and forcibly enough to be taken seriously; how much of the meta-rational argument comes across as arbitrary next to Kant (and Heidegger), and arbitrarily expressed?

“...the creation of America enacted the dissolution of history into socio-linguistic disguises...” (Further Notes, 17-18)

What constitutes a “socio-linguistic disguise”; or (especially), a uniquely and representatively American socio-linguistic disguise? If these disguises create a simulacrum of the “presence of the present,” what exactly, indigenously American or not, was being disguised? What textual discourse could transcend the status of a disguise into representatively American disguises?

Adam Fielded, 2013